

Application No.: 09/832,966
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2005
Amendment Dated November 23, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of August 23, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 29-39 have been added. Applicants submit that these new claims are fully supported by the specification, and thus introduce no new matter to the application. Claims 20 and 27 have been amended, and claims 21, 24, and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 20 and 27-39 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, applicants note with appreciation the courtesies extended by Examiner Bonshock to the undersigned and Mr. Brisnehan during the telephonic interview of September 20. At least some of the comments below encompass the totality of the issues discussed during the interview, and, as such, provide the substance of the interview in accord with MPEP § 713.04.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As discussed during the interview, to expedite prosecution and to improve clarity, applicants have amended claim 20. Specifically, claim 20 has been amended to recite "associating a first property with the first file type" and "associating a second property with the second file type." In light of these amendments, as agreed during the interview, claim 20 meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph.

Applicants note that new claims 32, 35, and 39 recite "user-selectable" properties, which are supported by the specification. *Application*, Abstract.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 20, 21, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), as being anticipated by *Poole*, "Mac OS 8.5 Bible" (hereinafter *Poole*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With regard to independent claim 20, the Office Action alleges that *Poole* teaches, on pages 130 and 131 specifically the "Label" column of Figure 6-17, "wherein the second property is different from the first property." Office Action, page 3, line 19 - page 4, line 3. Applicants

Application No.: 09/832,966

Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2005

Amendment Dated November 23, 2005

respectfully disagree. The same *property* ("Label") is displayed for every item in Figure 6-17, even though the *value* of that property ("Cool," "In Progress," "Essential," etc.) may vary from item to item. Even the properties represented by the graphical triangular icons and folder icons on the left side of Figure 6-17, which indicate whether or not the item is a folder, must be present for all items under *Poole*, even if the property has a null value, as it does for the non-folder items. That specific location on *Poole*'s display screen cannot be used to display a different property, counter to the claims of the instant application. In *Poole*, this area of the display screen must either be used to display the value of that one property, or it is not used at all. Therefore, *Poole* does not teach displaying property values of different files at the same location relative to the file, "wherein the second property is different from the first property," as recited in claim 20.

Claims 29-32 are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) in view of their dependence, directly or indirectly, on claim 20, and in view of the additional features recited therein. For example, claim 29 further recites "wherein all files having the first file type are displayed such that the value of the first property of the file is displayed in the same location relative to the graphical representation of the file." As this element is not disclosed by *Poole*, claim 29 is likewise allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), as are dependent claims 30-32.

Independent claims 27 (amended) and 36 (new) recite steps similar to claim 20 of displaying the values of different properties in the same "slot" or the same "location relative to the graphical representation of the file." Thus, for the reasons discussed above with respect to the claim 20, independent claims 27 and 36 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over *Poole*. Claims 33-35 and 37-39 are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) in view of their respective dependence, directly or indirectly, on claims 27 and 36, and in view of the additional features recited therein. Claims 33 and 37, for example, recite a similar feature as claim 29, discussed above.

Application No.: 09/832,966
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2005
Amendment Dated November 23, 2005

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request prompt notification of the same. If any fees are required for this submission, or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: November 23, 2005

By: /Ross Dannenberg/ Reg. No. 49,024
Ross Dannenberg, on behalf of
Gary D. Fedorochko
Reg. No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001